## Case 1:15-cr-00607-WHP Document 37 Filed 10/15/15 Page 1 of 17

F9hdcapc UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, New York, N.Y. 15 Cr. 0607(WHP) 4 V. JAMES CAPERS, et al., 5 6 Defendants. -----x 7 8 September 17, 2015 11:50 a.m. 9 Before: 10 HON. WILLIAM H. PAULEY III, 11 District Judge 12 13 **APPEARANCES** 14 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the 15 Southern District of New York BY: SCOTT A. HARTMAN JESSICA R. LONERGAN 16 JASON M. SWERGOLD 17 Assistant United States Attorneys ANDREW G. PATEL 18 Attorney for Defendant James Capers 19 NATALI J.H. TODD 20 Attorney for Defendant Tommy Brown 21 JOHN ANTHONY DIAZ Attorney for Defendant Jessie Irvin 22 SARAH KUNSTLER 23 Attorney for Defendant Marquise Rochester 24 JEFFREY G. PITTELL Attorney for Defendant Edwin Moye 25

F9hdcapc

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED
2	XAVIER ROBERT DONALDSON Attorney for Defendant Unique Christopher
3	DAVID TOUGER
4	Incoming Attorney for Defendant Unique Christopher
5	THOMAS FRANCIS DUNN Attorney for Defendant Dante Rodgers - also present -
6	
7	Kelley Sharkey Attorney to be appointed for Defendant Christian McKnight
8	
9	
10	000
11	THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.
12	Please bring in the defendants.
13	THE CLERK: Matter on for initial conference before
14	the Court, United States of America against James Capers, et
15	al.
16	Will counsel for the government please state their
17	appearances for the record.
18	MR. HARTMAN: Good morning, your Honor. Scott Hartman
19	with Jessica Lonergan and Jason Swergold for the government.
20	THE COURT: All right. Good morning.
21	MS. LONERGAN: Good morning, your Honor.
22	THE CLERK: And for the defendants, starting with
23	Mr. Capers.
24	MR. PATEL: Good morning, your Honor. Andrew Patel
25	for Mr. Capers. Mr. Capers is seated in the jury box.

MR. DONALDSON: Yes. Related to this case, yes.

representation in other matters in the Bronx?

24

25

1 THE COURT: All right. Very well.

Then, Mr. Touger, you are the CJA attorney on duty today who I asked to be here, and I understand from the U.S. Attorney's Office there are no potential conflicts. So, accordingly, I'm appointing you in Mr. Donaldson's place instead as counsel for Mr. Christopher.

And I trust, Mr. Donaldson, that you will cooperate in every way with Mr. Touger --

MR. DONALDSON: I already have.

THE COURT: Very well. Thank you very much for your service to the court, Mr. Donaldson. You are excused.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Touger, why don't you come up and take a seat at counsel table.

THE CLERK: And counsel for Mr. Rodgers.

MR. DUNN: Good morning, your Honor. Thomas Dunn for Mr. Rodgers, and Mr. Rodgers is seated next to me.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon -- or good morning to you, Mr. Dunn. I note Mr. Rodgers' presence.

And, finally, just for the record, I note the presence of Kelley Sharkey in the well of the courtroom. I understand that the defendant, Mr. McKnight, has not yet been writted in here and, accordingly, you haven't yet been appointed, but it is anticipated that you will be appointed when he is arraigned. So I thank you as a courtesy to the Court for being here this

morning

MS. SHARKEY: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Hartman, this is an initial conference. Briefly, what are the nature of the charges that the government has lodged against the defendants and what discovery does the government have to provide to their counsel?

MR. HARTMAN: Your Honor, this is primarily a racketeering case. The defendants are charged with being members of what the government has termed in the Indictment the Leland Avenue Crew -- it is named after a street in the Bronx, Leland Avenue -- where the organization, the enterprise primarily operated. It was a street gang that these members or these defendants participated in.

In connection with their participation in this street gang, they engaged in a variety of violent acts -- shootings and assaults and such -- as well as narcotics trafficking, specifically crack cocaine trafficking. And they were engaged in an ongoing dispute with a rival street gang based on Taylor Avenue, which is another street in the Bronx that was a couple of streets over. And we've charged -- I just want to note for the record so the Court is aware, and I think the Court may already been aware, we charged 11 members of the Taylor Avenue crew in a companion case that is currently before Judge Failla with racketeering charges as well.

In addition to the racketeering conspiracy, which is

Count One of the Indictment, we've also charged all of the defendants in a crack cocaine conspiracy, which is Count Three of the Indictment, and we've charged six of the eight defendants with using and carrying firearms in connection with the racketeering conspiracy.

We've also charged Mr. Capers with the July 7th, 2015 murder of a rival gang member from Taylor Avenue, and in connection with that we've charged him in Count Two with a racketeering murder. We've also charged him with a drug murder in Count Four and a 924(j) in Count Five.

With respect to the discovery, we expect there to be substantial discovery in this case, Judge. There have been a number of controlled purchases of crack cocaine from the defendants in this case. So in connection with that, we expect there to be audio and video recordings and other documents relating to those controlled purchases.

We've also executed search warrants on the Facebook pages of a number of these defendants. Those productions tend to be very large because we tend to get a lot of data from those. And so that discovery will all be produced. It is our intention at this time to produce the discovery, those Facebook pages, to all of the defendants, not on a defendant-specific basis.

We've also searched a number of cell phones that were seized by the NYPD in connection with the state offense arrests

for some of these defendants, and so we will be producing those as a result of those searches as well.

There are numerous jail calls -- thousands of jail calls, actually -- involving these defendants that were recorded primarily at Rikers island when they were detained in connection with various state offenses that are in some cases relevant to this case and in some cases not.

There are also property vouchers related to seizures of firearms and controlled substances that were made by the New York City Police Department in connection with some of these state offense arrests.

There are YouTube videos in which the defendants hold themselves out as members of the Leland Avenue Crew where they sometimes refer to them as the Paper Gang or Paper Avenue Gang.

There are also reports -- crime scene reports and photographs related to certain acts of violence that were investigated by the NYPD, not just the murder on July the 7th but also other shootings and such, which we would prove up as overt acts in furtherance of the racketeering conspiracy at the trial in this case. So we will be producing those materials as well.

There are also videos -- surveillance videos in connection with some of those shootings that were obtained from businesses in the area that captured relevant facts.

So that's the universe of discovery that we expect to

produce in the case. There may be some other things as well.

THE COURT: Are there any statements by any of the defendants in custody?

MR. HARTMAN: In some cases there were statements that were made, so we do intend to produce those on an individual basis. So apart from what I've just outlined, which is all group discovery and we intend to produce for the most part to all of the defendants, we will be producing to each individual defendant on an individual basis his prior criminal history record, his rap sheet. We'll also be producing NYPD arrest reports for certain of the arrests that each defendant has been the subject of in the past, because we will in some cases be attempting at trial to prove up the facts underlying those arrests as conduct in furtherance of the racketeering enterprise. So we are producing those arrest reports to give defense counsel notice of some of the facts that we would intend to prove up.

And then we will also -- to the extent that post-arrest statements were made, we will produce that information to defense counsel as well. My understanding is anyone who made a post-arrest statement, it was videotaped, so we will be producing that video file as well.

With respect to the group discovery, Judge, we have been in communication with Mr. Patel about the best way to get that out to the defendants. We are going to continue to have

discussions about how to do that. We do anticipate that within the next 30 to 45 days we can substantially complete discovery in this case. And we may come back to the Court if it appears appropriate to appoint a discovery coordinator, but if there is another more efficient way to get the discovery out, we'll talk to Mr. Patel about what that would be and go with the route that will ensure that the defendants have the evidence and the discovery as soon as possible.

THE COURT: Is the government going to produce all of the discovery in electronic format?

MR. HARTMAN: We do intend to, Judge, and given the quantity of the discovery, we expect it will be on a hard drive. So it is possible that we would just solicit hard drives from all of the defendants and produce it that way. Given that we do produce on a rolling basis because there is a lot of material, it might be more efficient to have, you know, one member of the defense team receive all the CDs and then others will copy them. We will talk to Mr. Patel about the best way to get the discovery out.

THE COURT: What about getting that electronic discovery to the defendants who are in custody?

MR. HARTMAN: My understanding, Judge, is that the majority of the defendants are in BOP facilities. They are at the MDC, I think, for the most part. There is one defendant at the MCC. And we'll talk to the marshals about whether or not

that is going to remain that way.

Because of the fact that we've charged this rival gang, my understanding is that the marshals intended to detain the defendants in this case at the MDC and the defendants in the other case at the MCC. So I think that the defendant detained in the MCC in this case may ultimately be moved to the MDC, but we'll talk to the marshals about that.

My understanding is that the MDC will receive discs from defense counsel. Each defendant, I think, is allowed to have up to 200 discs in his cell. But if we put the material on a hard drive, the government will provide that to the MDC and the MDC will make it available to all the defendants who are charged in the case.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Hartman.
Mr. Patel.

MR. PATEL: Your Honor, I just want to raise one question. Surveillance videos, including -- I can't believe that I am about to say this, but post-arrest interviews in the Bronx are all on proprietary software. So unless the government converts it to something more universal, none of us are going to be able to see that.

THE COURT: What about that, Mr. Hartman?

MR. HARTMAN: Judge, if I could address that?

Generally what we do is we provide the software that's

required to view the videos. That said, the technology

particularly at the MDC and the MCC tends to be either antiquated or secure in a way that you can't run these programs. So what we intend to do is to have our in-house tech people, to the extent that they can, convert the videos to a playable format. And when we put it on a hard drive, we will do it in a format that should be playable. Sometimes it is an iterative process. We have to hear back from defense counsel about certain files that there are problems with, and we work with them to get that done.

Judge, the other thing I did want to address is with respect to Mr. Capers, the capital case process, because I omitted to discuss that with the Court. This case has not yet been declared by the Attorney General with respect to the government's decision about whether or not to seek the death penalty. We do anticipate that this is a case in which we can make that decision without the need for mitigation discovery from the defense. And so what we intend to do is put together a submission that will be sent to DC within the next couple of weeks.

Generally that decision, it varies a lot, Judge, in terms of how much time it takes to get the decision back from them. But I know recently I had a case where the committee passed on the decision within 60 days.

So I think what Mr. Patel is -- based on my conversations with defense counsel, we expect that they are

going to be asking the Court to come back in about three months. I think it is likely we will have a decision on the capital case issue at that time.

THE COURT: Does the government believe that they can complete then the production of all of this material on a rolling basis within 45 days?

MR. HARTMAN: That's our hope, Judge. We do believe it is possible and we are going to be working diligently to get that done. If for some reason we encounter a major obstacle in that regard, we'll certainly talk with defense counsel and if we need to we'll come back to the Court.

obstacles might be dealing with converting this proprietary software into something that's viewable by defense counsel and the defendants. And because I generally like to see any statements by a defendant in custody provided swiftly to all defense counsel, I'm going to urge the government to start with that. It will serve two purposes. It will comply with my view that defense counsel need to know what their clients have said, and we'll uncover any flaws in the conversion process early on rather than at the end of the day.

Does that make sense to you?

MR. HARTMAN: Judge, that makes total sense and we will prioritize those statements.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Patel.

MR. PATEL: Your Honor, thank you. Mr. Hartman and I have been this road before, and, ironically, the only proprietary system that we haven't quite figured out yet is the one used by the Bronx Homicide Unit. I have no idea why they would pay money for something that they could get for free, but there we have it. So that's been a little bit of a stumbling block in the past. Hopefully, we can get through that.

But, your Honor, Mr. Hartman correctly anticipated our request was to come back in approximately three months. That should give us time to start to get our arms around this. I must tell you, I would be very surprised if we had an answer from the Attorney General by then but I would be delighted.

THE COURT: All right. Does any other defense counsel wish to take a view separate from that that's been expressed by Mr. Patel?

(Pause)

Then I'm going to require the government to complete the production of discovery on a rolling basis, let's say, by October 30th. And then looking down from there, I will put this matter on for a further conference on December 18th at 2 o'clock with a view at that time that defense counsel may be in a position to inform the Court as to what motions, if any, they may wish to make prior to trial. And assuming, perhaps optimistically, that the Attorney General will have made a

decision in this case, I'll be fixing a trial date on 1 December 18th. 2 3 Is that a schedule that is acceptable? 4 MR. HARTMAN: That is fine for the government, Judge. MR. PATEL: Thank you, your Honor. That is fine. 5 6 THE COURT: What are the defendants' respective views, 7 then, regarding the exclusion of time between now and December 18, 2015? 8 9 MR. PATEL: On behalf of Mr. Capers, your Honor, I 10 consent to the exclusion of time. 11 MS. TODD: On behalf of Mr. Brown, I consent to the 12 exclusion of time. 13 MR. DIAZ: On behalf of Jessie Irvin, we consent to 14 the exclusion of time, your Honor. 15 MS. KUNSTLER: On behalf of Mr. Rochester, we consent. 16 MR. PITTELL: On behalf of Mr.Moye, we would consent, 17 Judge. 18 MR. TOUGER: As to Mr. Christopher, we consent. MR. DUNN: Your Honor, I consent on behalf of 19 20 Mr. Rodgers. 21 THE COURT: All right. Since this continuance is due 22 to the government's need to provide voluminous discovery to the 23 defendants and the defendants' need to review that discovery in 24 order to determine what motions, if any, to make, I

prospectively exclude the time from today until December 18,

25

2015 from Speedy Trial Act calculations. I find that this continuance serves to ensure the effective assistance of counsel and prevents any miscarriage of justice. Additionally, I find that the ends of justice served by such a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and each of the defendants in a speedy trial pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3161.

So I'm setting this matter down at 2:30 on December 18th.

Are there any other issues that counsel wish to raise?

MR. HARTMAN: Judge, I just wanted to clarify the time for the next conference.

THE COURT: 2:30.

MR. HARTMAN: 2:30?

THE COURT: Yeah. I think I said 2 o'clock earlier and I misspoke.

MR. HARTMAN: Thank you, Judge.

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, I would just like the Court's permission to order the minutes from Mr. Christopher's arraignment down in the Magistrate's, the presentation.

THE COURT: Your application is granted. Just submit something, Mr. Touger.

All right. Everyone in the courtroom is to remain seated until the defendants are escorted from the courtroom, and the marshals may escort them now.

## Case 1:15-cr-00607-WHP Document 37 Filed 10/15/15 Page 17 of 17

F9hdcapc (Pause) (Defendants not present) THE COURT: Have a good afternoon. THE CLERK: All rise. MR. SWERGOLD: Thank you, your Honor.